



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/770,039 | 01/25/2001 | Philip R. Thrift | TI-29973 | 5611 |
| 23494 | 7590 | 12/02/2003 | EXAMINER | |
| TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999 DALLAS, TX 75265 | | | NGUYEN, LOAN B | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2126 | |

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/770,039 | THRIFT ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Loan B Nguyen | 2126 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2001.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-4 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1 and 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brooks et al. (5842014) (hereinafter Brooks et al.).

4. As per claim 1, Brooks et al. teaches a system, comprising:

(a) a general purpose processor (e.g. col. 5 line 36-42);

(b) a digital signal processor coupled to said general purpose processor (e.g. col. 5 line 49-52);

(c) a first software system operating on said general purpose processor, said first software system including a media framework with a first interface for a plug-in (e.g. col. 7 line 16-25);

(d) a second software system operating on said digital signal processor, said second software system including a second framework with a second interface for a plug-in (e.g. col. 6 line 30-35 and col. 7 line 30-32);

(e) said first and second software systems each containing portions forming a communication bridge coupling said first and second software systems (e.g. col. 7 line 37-40); and

(f) an extending interface in said first software system, said extending interface coupling to said second framework (e.g. col. 8 line 51-60).

5. As per claim 2, Brooks et al. teaches the system of claim 1, wherein:

(a) said second framework includes a resource manager which registers a plug-in to said second plug-in interface (e.g. col. 7 line 16-17).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks et al. (5842014) (hereinafter Brooks et al.) in view of Wong et al. (6216152) (hereinafter Wong et al.).

Art Unit: 2126

7. As per claim 3, Brooks et al. does not specifically teach a said plug-in is a media codec.

(a) Wong et al. teaches a plug-in is a media codec (e.g. abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Brook et al. with Wong et al. because it would accomplish allow the user application using a software decoder as the plug-in media decoder to processing and handling the media data object.

8. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fenton (6445697) (hereinafter Fenton) in view of Wong et al. (6216152) (hereinafter Wong et al.).

9. As per claim 4, Fenton teaches a method of processing media streams, comprising:

(a) providing host processor with a first software system (e.g. col. 4 line 56-60);

(b) providing a digital signal processor with a second software system and coupled to said host processor and first software system (e.g. col. 5 line 8-13);

(c) providing an host application coupled to said first software system and a signal processing application coupled to said second software system (e.g. col. 5 line 1-6 and col. 6 line 16-21);

(d) transfer a first data frame from said first software system to a first buffer of said second software system (e.g. col. 5 line 14-26);

(e) send a message from said first software system to said signal processing application (e.g. col. 6 line 1-12);

Wong et al. teaches a method of processing media stream:

(f) send a message from said signal processing application to said first software system

designating a second buffer in said second software system for a second data frame plus said signal processing application processes said first data frame (e.g. col. 9 line 28-33);

(g) transfer a second data frame from said first software system to said second buffer of said second software system (e.g. col. 11 line 11-42);

(h) send a message from said signal processing application to said first software system designating a third buffer in said second software system and containing said first data after processing (e.g. col. 7 line 38-65);

(i) said first software system provides said first data frame after processing to said host application (e.g. col. 9 line 37-41); and

(j) repeat steps (d)-(i) for subsequent data frames and buffers (e.g. col. 13 line 3-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Fenton with Wong et al. because it would accomplish allow processing media/audio data stream from the computer system containing a host processor associates new audio data stream with one of digital signal processors (DSPs) by using a codec processing resource.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Loan B. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-0358. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM - 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Loan B. Nguyen
November 25, 2003



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100